

## COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

**May 1, 2006**

**5:00 PM**

Chairman Thibault called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Thibault, Forest, Roy, Long

Absent: Alderman Smith

Messrs.: Atty. Manchester, M. Duffy, D. Beauchesne, K. Dillon

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Attorney Brad Cook on behalf of the 1902 Fire House Trust requesting to purchase, renovate and maintain the Weston Fire Station.

*Assessors – recommend outside fee appraisal;*

*Planning – requesting further time to review and study; and*

*Tax Collector – no interest as it is not a tax-deeded parcel.*

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we would note that there was a substitute proposal that was submitted to the Committee. It is an updated proposal.

Chairman Thibault stated as I understand it, the Planning Board needs more time to come up with their recommendation.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Planning Department indicated that they were requesting further time to review and study and I believe that Mr. Beauchesne is here to address that.

Alderman Duval stated a number of months ago we began a discussion related to the Weston Street FireHouse. It was certainly my desire at the time to see an analysis done and a search for possible funding for rehabilitation of this historic landmark. Regrettably as a result of that process that was undertaken with the participation of a number of experts and department heads in the City it was ultimately determined that it would be cost prohibitive due to the deteriorating condition of the building. Again it would just be cost prohibitive to do anything with it. The City didn't express any interest and the Board at some time, I think it

was in March, decided to authorize the demolition of the Weston Street Fire House. A number of people expressed regret. Certainly me being one of them. I had a fantasy of enabling a public/private partnership to restore the building for some future yet to be determined use but again due to the cost of such an endeavor it became very evident that that was not likely to happen. It is, again, expressed with regret because for 21 years the building has sat vacated and left unattended and as a result has fallen into considerable disrepair to put it mildly. Along the way and since it has been publicized in the paper that the building was scheduled for demolition, there have been a couple of people that have come forward to express further interest. Amongst them was Ward 4 resident, Mike Duffy who telephoned me immediately after it was made public that the building would be demolished. Mr. Duffy is a Ward 4 resident who lives on lower Concord Street and has ties to the community that go back years. I commend him for expressing interest in doing something with the building. I did get a copy of the proposal that the Committee has before them from Brad Cook's office and I understand Atty. Manchester is here representing Mr. Duffy as one of the participants in putting forth this proposal. I met with...I took the opportunity to meet with Atty. Brad Cook, Atty. Manchester, Mr. Duffy and David Murray at Mr. Cook's office and expressed to them concerns I had relative to the proposal that you have in hand, three of which I think the Committee should take seriously. That would be the possibility of relinquishing that corner lot on that very, very important parcel of land, that very significant parcel of land. Right now it is under Parks purview including the corner where the building exists currently and it has served as a passive play area for kids in the neighborhood for years. McDonough school children use it as do people on upper Hanover Hill. I have expressed to Mr. Duffy and to Atty. Cook and Atty. Manchester and Mr. Murray that the City would have...it would have to be proven that it would be a considerable upside to the City if we were to seriously consider such a proposal. Once the City relinquishes ownership of that land it is gone and we should take that most seriously. Secondly, I mentioned concern over the duration in the event the City would decide to move forward with the proposal, the duration of completion of the project and so on and so forth. I think the first and most pressing issue in my view anyway and members of the Committee would be whether this Committee has an interest in relinquishing those property rights and I think that is a huge question for this Committee to consider. That is pretty much where we are. I appreciate your time.

Chairman Thibault stated these people are here today so why don't we just hear what their proposal is and then we can make a decision as to how we are going to handle this and what we are going to do with it. Why don't we do that?

Susan Manchester, Attorney, stated I am here because Brad Cook is in Washington, DC. Since the original proposal that you have had as you have heard

we met with Aldermen and communicated with various other people. We have also tried to reach the School personnel but last week was school vacation week so the timing was a little tricky. We received the report from the Assessors and we have a simpler, modified proposal, which we think addresses many of those concerns. Before I go into the proposal I really want you to listen to Mike Duffy and let him tell you why he wants to save this building for the City.

Michael Duffy, 367 Concord Street, Manchester stated I have lived in my house for almost 20 years and I have done and continue to do most of the restoration work myself. I have also worked as a house painter, a carpenter and a tinsmith on old houses all over New England. These days I am a Sexton at Grace Episcopal Church here in Manchester, a couple of blocks from here. My time in and around historic buildings has given me a fascination with things of the past and a deep respect for the people from whom we have inherited them and a passion to preserve them for the future. This passion can be contagious and has resulted in our proposal to restore the Weston Street FireHouse. Our idea is a simple one – to convert the station into a single family house, which would beautifully fit into the fabric of the neighborhood of which it has been a significant part for over 100 years. In my opinion, perhaps clouded by my own love of old buildings, it would make the transition to private use very easily. It is a lovely, very well built brick edifice with some truly beautiful features, including the brick relieving arches over the doors and windows, the granite windowsills and date marker, the simple wooden cornice on the front wall and the graceful bracketed portico over the back door. Inside are beautiful 4 over 2 and 8 over 2 original window sashes, doorways all with transoms, beaded board, wainscoting and a lovely Victorian staircase. It is not the most elaborate fire station in the world or even in Manchester, but it is a well done and functional piece of work and it is now the oldest one in town. It is important to preserve this building for several reasons. Our built heritage provides a very real way to experience the history of a place and to link ourselves with the past. Buildings from the past are an inheritance from our forebearers, including the people who built them and the people who worked and lived in them for years. In this case, these include the firefighters who have risked or lost their lives keeping the rest of us safe. Adaptive reuse of historic buildings is a significant element in any vital community with a strong quality of life. Among the strongest attributes of Manchester, NH are its history, its architecture and its neighborhoods. This proposal will improve our quality of life rating in all three areas. In talking about this project, I understand that there may be an interest in expanding the McDonough School in the future. It makes me glad to see all of the new school aged kids in my neighborhood down the hill from the school and the firehouse. People want to live in Manchester and our inner City neighborhoods are alive and well. Excellent and adequate schools are another significant quality of life issue that no one wants to inhibit. In a City that also respects historic preservation, these are not mutually exclusive. In fact, a restored 1902 firehouse next to the

school could even provide an impetus for lessons in history, architecture, technology, economics and even City government. These kid will never know the Webster Street, Amory Street or Lake Avenue fire stations, nor the Boston & Maine railroad station, nor the Governor Smith mansion but they will be able to know what a neighborhood fire house looked at in 1902 if we, as a community, do our best to honor our ancestors and their buildings. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

Atty. Manchester stated as for the revised proposal, what we are seeking is a 90-day option if you will to close after 90 days. The option period would give us the opportunity to further investigate the condition of the premises to see if it is cost prohibitive. I know that my client thinks it is not but at the end of the 90 days we would acquire the property for \$1. The deed would have restrictions in it so that there would be no further subdivision. We got rid of the whole tax thing so that the fixed taxes is gone and the having charity events there is gone. In lieu of that for incentives to the City we would agree to give you 25% of the profit when the building is sold. We would also agree that there would be reverter rights if various timelines weren't met, such as we didn't start construction in 90 days or we didn't ask for a CO. We reduced that to two years from three years after listening to Alderman Duval thinking that two years is an appropriate time. We could obviously add other ones as well. At closing we would have evidence of financial wherewithal between \$50,000 and \$75,000 to remove the asbestos, do the initial renovations, put up security fencing and those are the highlights. What is the win-win to the City? There is a win-win to the City. This is what the City gets. It doesn't have to spend \$100,000 this year to demolish a building. It gives a reprieve if you will. You have the reverter if nothing happens. We recognize that this property may be valuable to the school but it sits on the corner and we want to work with the school to figure it out. I share Mike's passion in the sense that this City is great because of its heritage and it's buildings and it really would be a shame to tear it down unnecessarily. Once the property is conveyed to Mike then the City wouldn't have any liability. We would get it insured. So you would get real estate taxes and when the property was sold you would get some more money. There is a significant benefit to the City in all of this.

Chairman Thibault stated I see somebody from Planning here. Did you have any other questions? According to what I have in my notes you people had some questions.

David Beauchesne, Planning Department, stated we just wanted to point out that we received a request from the City Clerk's Office to comment on this on April 18 and we haven't had adequate time. It has been a short period of time. Alderman Duval spoke earlier and I think adequately outlined a range of matters that dealt with issues related to how the City may use the property in the future. We are also

aware that there is possibly one other private sector group that has an interest that hasn't quite yet stepped forward. We just need a little more time to try to put all of our thoughts from the Planning Department's point of view into proper context.

Chairman Thibault called the Assessor forward.

David Cornell, Chairman, Board of Assessors, stated it is our recommendation that an outside fee appraisal be done on the property. Typically the first step in the appraisal process is defining actually what we are giving away. Clearly, this isn't as simple as selling a piece of land. If we are selling a piece of land with many restrictions, that does affect the value of the property. We are recommending an outside appraisal be done on the property.

Chairman Thibault asked what kind of a price tag would go on an appraisal like that.

Mr. Cornell answered it is typically around \$2,500 or so. That would be assuming that it is a commercial appraisal. If it is going to be a residential appraisal it would be much less than that. What complicates it are a couple of issues. Number one is there are some asbestos issues and some structural issues that need to be addressed. Thirdly there are the restrictions of the property that need to be addressed like how the property is sold in the future and different restrictions on the property does affect the market value of the property so that will all have to be considered in the appraisal process.

Alderman Roy stated I'm going to start with the good and work to the bad. As I said before I'm absolutely appalled at the condition this building has gotten to at this point and I know different groups have come forward over the years to try to keep it from that and I'm appalled at myself as being a member of this body and other bodies that have come before me that we're now in this position. That being said if there's a passion to keep this building and if there's someone who wants to keep this building I definitely agree with that but now I get to the bad part. If this building can be kept, I believe because of where it sits on that property it should be kept by the City. I voted the way I did when it came to this Board the last time because we were guaranteed that this building could not be salvaged and before any decision is made to do anything with it I think we need a clear cut answer on that. That being said if it is savable and this goes more to the applicant or the gentlemen looking to do this, I share your passion for old houses and I commend you for it and I've always been one that has said if a piece of land in this City shouldn't be owned by the City we shouldn't be in the real estate business. This has sat on the corner and has deteriorated and been left alone for too many years but the corner that it does sit on is a large chunk of land and we are looking at possible crisis situations with our schools to expand or to replace elementary

schools. That being said as far as the location of this building goes I would be hesitant to vote to sell it off just because that would limit what we can do with the rest of that property. I do commend you for coming forward. I wish some of the proposals that came through 10 and 15 years ago were met with a better response...something does need to be done and the two things I would suggest is that if it is going to be sold off to a party outside of the City that we go through a very fair process of announcing that and working forward from there so everyone has the opportunity. This does seem like a good proposal but there may be a better one out there and that's just the fairness and you'll always find that with me. The second part is we have to take a really hard look if this is going to go outside the City's control is it the best thing long-term for the City. I've been a huge advocate for getting property off of our non-tax revenue side or non-tax holding side and back in the public hands but when I look at the map of this property it's a large piece of property with a very small corner and I think that may impede what we can do in that area. I think this needs to be looked at longer on the City side and then if we go the public direction then to make it fully public.

Alderman Lopez stated the comments that Alderman Roy stated were basically my comments so I don't need to comment anymore.

Alderman Long stated exactly what Alderman Roy said are exactly my feelings adding that if my memory serves me correctly when we voted to demolish the property was because the residents in that area had concerns with either someone getting hurt or it was just open for abuse and what frightens me again tonight is we had a proposal 4/17/06 and we have another proposal 5/01/06. Once again, from my understanding, the foundation needed repair and also in order to keep the outer lining you have a foundation problem. It seems to me that \$50,000 to \$75,000 doesn't quite cover what the immediate securing of this premises would need and another one of my concerns is the security of this property...one of the reasons why I voted to demolish it was I was concerned about the asbestos and the kids using the property...having access to it and the structural integrity of it and if I can, Mr. Chairman, can I ask Mr. Cornell a question. With respect to taxation, have you seen that proposal?

Mr. Cornell replied yes I have.

Alderman Long asked would there be any conservation restrictions or discretionary easements with respect to showing this property to the public. Having it a public/private property? Would you know?

Mr. Cornell replied I did see the first proposal and there was the tax problem that we addressed with limiting the taxes to a specific amount. So clearly under the

RSA if it is owned by a for-profit business it has to be based on its fair market value and the taxes are derived from that.

Alderman Long stated whether or not there's restrictions to opening up to the public a couple times of year or some conservation.

Atty. Manchester stated just for clarification we took that out of the proposal.

Alderman Long stated I'm trying to establish whether the taxes for the property, if it was to sell, would be the full market share, full market price or would they have some discretionary tax easements.

Mr. Cornell stated if there were no easements there would be the full market value. Certainly, if you put restrictions on a property it can affect the fair market value of the property. My understanding is since those have been removed that wouldn't be an issue so then it would be then just basically a fee simple viewing of the property with all of its rights.

Alderman Forest stated Mr. Duffy I commend you on your ideas and what you want to do with this building. One, I was around when they took the Smith Mansion. I was around when they took the old Depot. I was around when they tore down St. Mary's Bank. There were a lot of things that were done under urban renewal and again I commend you for your thoughts of repairing and trying to keep this building alive but we do need information and the information we certainly got was the fact that the building was unrepairable. Although I've seen buildings in probably worse condition that were repaired, rebuilt and everything else again I would not vote tonight to do anything with this property until I had all of the information that was pertinent to this project and I know my colleagues feel pretty much the same way from their comments and we have to go through the process and right now the process is not ready for a decision to sell or give away the property.

Chairman Thibault stated one thing I would like to say before we do anything is that in listening to Planning who feels that need a little more time to look into this and find out exactly where it should go I think that we ought to instruct the School Department also to come up with some kind of an idea as to what they intend, in the future to do with that property if anything so that we can all be in the know before we make a decision as to sell it or to renovate it or to keep it or to do whatever. Unless somebody has a motion to make.

Alderman Duval stated I just want to stress that as far as I know there is future planned usage for this parcel of land. I'll make that abundantly clear. I don't want to alarm neighbors unnecessarily.

Chairman Thibault stated Schools has no plans for it.

Alderman Duval stated the School has expressed no interest in that property and there's been no other government entity that has expressed in the property. I don't think that is what we are speaking of specifically. I think it's just a general question that I raised and brought to the attention of Mr. Duffy in light of his proposal and that was basically the City, this Board would have to determine whether it would be advisable to surrender property rights for such an integral piece of property that is contiguous with the vacant land that sits there and as I pointed out even under its current use could the Board see it's way to surrendering its ownership and I guess that to me is the number one question that would have to be answered by the Board. Today it is used passively, it is maintained by the City and I imagine over the years it will be utilized even more by our neighborhood youth and youth for passive recreation by nearby residents. So, it does abut McDonough School and I think that in future years perhaps if there was further expansion to McDonough that the property would only be used more, not less. So, that has to be taken into consideration and I think it's only fair to give and I said this from the outset to give ample consideration to abutters who have put up with an abandoned property for the past 21 years and they are entitled to being represented at the table and I think it's my obligation as Ward Alderman to make sure that they are represented at this table and at the same time allow Mr. Duffy a fair opportunity to present his case and he certainly has been given indication that it would be an uphill climb. But, I also think that in fairness to the City and that's where we put on our hat, our more global hat that we do have to think in the way of future and future planning and it's the obligation of this panel, I guess, to decide whether there is merit in proceeding with this presentation, with this proposal right in front of you and that I think the issues at hand are quite significant and quite glaring.

Chairman Thibault stated I appreciate your comments, Alderman Duval. Alderman O'Neil would like to say something.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have some great history having been brought up very near the fire station, I was brought up on Merrimack Street and almost somewhat in line with Hubbard Street where the fire trucks used to coming barreling down Hubbard Street on their calls. My father was brought up on Hubbard Street and to this day still have family living on Hubbard Street. I used to skate behind the fire station as a kid, go trick treating there, so it's near and dear to my heart. I was certainly very disappointed...I toured the station earlier this year with Alderman Duval on the condition of it and we could sit around and try and pass blame but the City as a body is to blame for its condition. I know in those discussions when we reached a conclusion that it's based on the information that we had from our



Facilities Division that it needed to be torn down. If I recall there was a price tag of almost \$1 million to rehab it, I have to believe that their numbers were somewhat good maybe Mr. Duffy could it a little bit cheaper but if he can maybe he should be working for the City and helping us out. But, I have some great reservation in selling that building and more importantly the property. It's used currently...the fields on both sides are used for neighborhood passive recreation, the field that runs along south of the parking lot east of the fire station has been used for young people for soccer and lacrosse. What I know about based upon the 215 feet that would be required as part of the request ...that would significantly impact usage both on the passive side as well as for little formal sports that are played there generally by younger age kids. So, I have to say I have some great reservations about this proposal and I think in fairness to Mr. Duffy the City needs to figure out what it wants to do with the property first. We know there may be a need to make some decisions regarding the school over the next year or two...I'm not sure how that property fits into that. So, at this time I would have some great reservations about voting to sell this land. Thank you.

Alderman Roy stated at this time I would like to put forward two motions and with somewhat of a regret because of the interest that Mr. Duffy has put forward and I commend him on that. The first one because it's just the logistics of it that we receive and file his request. The second is that we direct Planning and Facilities Maintenance or Highway Departments to come forward with as accurate information as they can so that this Board can make or this Committee can make up a fair assessment of that property. As Mr. Duffy suggested he has quite a bit of experience with older homes and that coupled with passion sometimes overrides a viewpoint of a Facilities Division of just tear it down and forget about it so I'd like to get some accurate information from our City departments.

Chairman Thibault stated let's see if we can get a second to your first motion.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion to receive and file. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Thibault stated on your second one, Mark.

Alderman Roy stated the second is to ask the Planning Department, Highway and through them the Facilities Division...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected did you want to add the Building Department to that?

Alderman Roy replied Building is fine.

Chairman Thibault stated Building and School...no, no School.

Alderman Roy stated to bring an analysis to this Committee so that we can make a decision in what direction this building is going to go in in the very near future.

Chairman Thibault asked should we put a timeframe on that.

Alderman Roy replied sixty (60) days.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Duval stated with regard to dealing with buildings of historical qualities in the future the Historic Commission including Commissioner Pappas who's here tonight we have discussed and agreed to a meeting that the City could perhaps institute ordinances that will better protect historic buildings. There has to be some way for the City to properly notify potential interested parties certainly the Historic Commission being one first and foremost when historic buildings or buildings of value in that way have a reasonable shot at being preserved and I think the only way to do that is probably to enact ordinances that force us to do that as a governmental entity and I think that's terribly important. Regrettably 21 years ago the City shut off the lights, locked the door and walked away from this building. I know over the years this wasn't the only proposal to come forward but it is late in the game so to speak not because of Mr. Duffy's fault for sure but there were proposals that came about 10 or 15 years ago I understand, a number of them and they were rejected by the City Fathers then. So, it is with regret but we have to be realists and there are many people in this City that are deserving representation on this very important issue and I know the Board takes that very seriously but I think we should enact ordinances and maybe Alderman Roy...he and I have talked about that and maybe we can put together...real soon...so we don't have this happen in the future.

Chairman Thibault stated with the City Solicitor you could probably come up with something that could be enacted...one thing that I've got to say is that I'm sure Alderman O'Neil and I share the same thing that we've been here a while and those were not the years that you could have done something with something like this...those were quite lean years in the City and every penny counted in those days as much as it does today but even worse then. But, thank you very much, gentlemen.

Chairman Thibault addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Chuck DePrima, Deputy Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemetery, requesting consolidation and lot line adjustment of property of David Larivee (Map 315, Lots 8 & 9) and City of Manchester (Map 314, Lot 7-A).

*Assessors - value of both parcels relatively equal and is a fair swap;*

*Planning - recommends 4,366 sf (parcel "A") be declared surplus, however, land swap would be inappropriate; and*

*Tax Collector –no interest as it is not a tax-deeded parcel.*

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Planning Department's report has been substituted indicating that a land swap would be appropriate.

Alderman Forest stated both you and I are familiar with at least the trail that is there. The only disappointing thing I have is we have some information here that is two pages long or actually one page that was just handed to us that maybe we should have gotten earlier.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded the communication from the Planning Department is merely a substitute of one word. There was a typographical error in the first communication enclosed in your agenda. It said that it was an inappropriate land swap and they are saying it is an appropriate land swap.

Alderman Roy stated just because it is a fairly serious typographical error and I suppose I can direct this to the Clerk or to Planning directly but did the viewpoint change or was it just simply a typographical error.

Mr. Beauchesne stated that was strictly a typo. That was our analysis from the get go.

Alderman Roy asked so the Planning Department feels that this is an absolutely appropriate use of land for us to swap.

Mr. Beauchesne stated yes we do. The Planning Board has looked at it and they have approved it. It has been a thorny issue for the City. It has essentially blocked passage of the Piscataquog River to the railway. The state had oversight on the matter also because in seating the land to the City and to the private entity that owned the piece, they kept certain rights and one was to approve of any land changes. They have reviewed this latest proposal and agreed to that also. So in a sense the ducks are in a row now and it seems like we can proceed and certainly the Planning Department supports that.

Alderman Lopez stated I can tell the Committee that it was a long haul to get to this point right now because Alderman Thibault and Alderman Smith and myself

and Alderman Forest for a number of years...I know that Parks has been trying to convince the owner of this particular item and I would ask the Committee to approve this because it is the railway over there. To get through this land it has been a lot of convincing and a lot of time and effort on not only the Solicitor's part but Planning, Parks & Recreation and Aldermen. I really think this is a great project for the City.

Chairman Thibault stated David Larivee has been exceptionally responsive to us. When we met four or five years ago to do whatever we needed to do he was willing to work with us. He has been a great inspiration frankly. I really approve of this and I would like to see it go through.

Alderman Forest stated if none of the other Aldermen have any objections I would like to make a motion that we approve this. I am not sure...I assume there are processes to follow. I want to move that we declare the property surplus and approve this land swap.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Chairman Thibault called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to remove all items from the table.

5. Communication from Attorney Michael Kasten, on behalf of Steve and Anna Sacco, proposing to enter into a Boundary Line Agreement with the City for property located at West Shore Avenue and Bodwell Road abutting Crystal Lake.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to receive and file this item.

6. Discussion of area for dog park.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I don't believe anything is happening with this at this point. I think this might be something that could come back in the event that there is something done.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to receive and file this item.

7. Communication from Russel Johnson, PSNH, seeking authorization to place a padmount transformer and cement slab (8' x 8') approximately five (5) feet from the back of the Visitors Center at Veterans Park.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated this was tabled at the request of PSNH in 2005. We have heard nothing back and unless somebody...

Alderman Long interjected I spoke with Mr. Johnson prior to our last meeting. The space that they needed to put this in was too cumbersome downtown.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to receive and file this item.

8. Communication from Gerald Hebert, Sr., requesting to purchase Lots 246-3, 6 & 7 on Page Street between London and Bridge Streets.  
*(Note: Tabled 7/19/2005. Communications from the Board of Assessors and Planning enclosed.)*

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there are communications from the Board of Assessors and Planning enclosed.

Alderman Forest asked are they in favor of this or opposed.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated David Beauchesne is here and maybe he can address that.

Alderman Forest stated there is a letter here from Bob MacKenzie's office stating that they would like to put it back on the tax rolls.

Alderman Roy stated just quickly reviewing the map of this property, this goes back to when Steve Tellier was the Chairman of the Board of Assessors. I would ask that unless the information from the purchaser...if that could be updated and we could instruct the new Chairman of the Board of Assessors to update the information and talk to the property owner that made the initial request and bring it back to us at our next meeting either for disposition or...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected they did provide you with an update of the value. Are you looking for them to go back to...

Alderman Roy interjected when was that.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated March 29, 2006 it says \$100,000 to \$125,000 is the value.

Mr. Cornell stated just to refresh your memory the parcels there, they went out to auction. At auction they sold for a little under \$60,000 and then it was determined that the site wasn't buildable because there were considerable wetlands on the property. It was then followed up with a second bidder. He looked at the property and said I can't build on it. Now the abutter would like to purchase the property essentially to add some extra land to his property. Last year there was some discussion that if he purchased that property what type of assemblage value, could he package it together and turn it into a buildable lot. So in our memo we basically tried to explain that as it sits now the City owned lot is a non-buildable lot because of the wetlands. As a non-buildable lot, the value in our opinion is worth about \$7,500 to \$10,000. However, he could structure it in such a way...it appears he could take some of the dry land from his lot and add it to the City owned lot and then get a buildable lot. As a buildable lot, it is worth between \$100,000 to \$125,000. Now typically the way the Assessors historically have always appraised City owned land is City owned land as is the way it sits. We don't consider any assemblage value. So that is basically what our letter was stating.

Alderman Roy stated my point is when you did your March 29 letter was the owner or the person looking to own these properties still asking for this to go forward. A considerable amount of time has gone by. I wish him good health but I have not heard anything but City reports in just under a year.

Mr. Cornell replied I am not sure if the individual would still be interested in it.

Alderman Roy stated that is the point I am trying to get at. Even if we vote it surplus do we then go ahead and have this person still available to purchase it?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated you can request the Assessor to go back and speak with them if that is what you want. I just wanted you to realize that you did have an updated value report there that's all.

Alderman Forest moved to retable it and have staff from the Assessor's Office talk to Mr. Hebert and report back to this Committee. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Chairman Thibault called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

9. Communication from City Solicitor Clark enclosing a communication from the State of NH Department of Transportation requesting to purchase city land for the proposed Manchester Airport Access Road.

*(Note: On 11/21/2005 referred to Airport requesting report back and requested Planning and Tax to determine whether or not property is*

*surplus to city needs. Planning recommends it be determined surplus to city needs due to the unique circumstances involved noting the committee may find suitable public purpose for selling the property to the state.) (Tabled 02/21/2006)*

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Mr. Dillon is here and perhaps he could address this for you.

Kevin Dillon, Airport Director, stated we would request that you keep this on the table. We are still in discussions with the state and I do believe it is going to take quite some time before we wrap this up. I would prefer it if you could leave it and I will notify the Committee when we are ready to make that report.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to table this item.

10. Communication from Paul J. Borek, Economic Development Director, regarding the Ash Street School property on Bridge Street.  
*(Note: Tabled 11/21/2005 pending report of School Board action. Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the School Board on 12/12/2005. Report dated 02/15/2006 submitted by the Director of Planning and Community Development enclosed herein.)*

Alderman Forest moved to put this item back on the table.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there is a recommendation by the Planning Department that it be found surplus and disposed of through public sale. I don't know if anybody caught that.

Alderman Forest asked isn't there a reverter right.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered I thought there was. Maybe David should come up and address this. I believe there is a reverter on the land, not on the building.

Alderman Forest asked so that means we can sell the building and they will have to move it.

Alderman Long stated if I recall we were looking for the reverter rights and what that entailed prior to making a decision on this. I believe Mr. Borek was supposed to...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected if you want to retable it we can request Mr. Borek to look into that with the Solicitor's Office perhaps.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to put this item back on the table.

Alderman Roy stated if I can just ask not only Paul Borek and the Solicitor but all of the departments to comment. The Assessors are going to have to give us a value and we are going to need a letter from Tax. If we could take care of that in the meantime.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we will start with the reverter clauses and then back into it with the departments.

11. Communication from Angelo Mazzella, General Manager of Manchester Wolves, requesting the use of the JFK Coliseum for practice sessions beginning the middle of March until the end of August.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to receive and file this item.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee